



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 13

MAY 1 2002

MAY 30 2002

OFFICE OF DIRECTOR  
GROUP

Oliff & Berridge, PLC  
P.O. Box 19928  
Alexandria, VA 22320

In re Application of: :  
Bjarke De Jaeger Gotfredsen :  
Application No. 09/674,714 :  
Filed: December 19, 2000 :  
Attorney Docket No. 107792 :

DECISION ON PETITION  
TO MAKE SPECIAL

This is a decision on the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d), filed April 22, 2002, to make the above-identified application special under the accelerated examination procedure set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.), Section 708.02, Item II: Infringement.

The petition is **granted**.

A grantable petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(d), and in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 708.02, Item II, must be accompanied by the required fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h), and a statement by the applicant, assignee, or an attorney/agent registered to practice before the Office alleging:

- (1) that there is an infringing device or product actually on the market or method in use;
- (2) that a rigid comparison of the alleged infringing device, product or method with the claims of the application was made, and that, in his or her opinion, some of the claims are unquestionably infringed; and
- (3) that he or she has made or caused to be made a careful and thorough search of the prior art or has a good knowledge of the pertinent prior art.

Applicant must also provide one copy of each of the references deemed most closely related to the subject matter encompassed by the claims if said references are not already of record.

The petition includes statements that comply with the above-stated requirements to permit the application to be made special. Accordingly, the petition is **granted**.

The application is being forwarded to the examiner for expedited prosecution.

If the examiner can make this application special without prejudice to any possible interfering applications, and he/she should make a rigid search for such, he/she is authorized to do so for the

next action. Should the application be rejected, the application will not be considered special for the subsequent action unless the applicant promptly makes a bona fide effort to place the application in condition for allowance, even if it is necessary to have an interview with the examiner to accomplish this purpose.

If the examiner finds any interfering application for the same subject matter, he/she should consider such application simultaneously with this application and should state in the official letter of such application that he/she is taking it out of its turn because of possible interference.

Should an appeal be taken in this application or should this application becomes involved in an interference, consideration of the appeal and the interference will be expedited by all Patent and Trademark Office officials concerned, contingent likewise upon diligent prosecution by the applicant.

After allowance, this application will be given priority for printing. See M.P.E.P. § 1309.

The petition is granted to the extent indicated.

It is noted that the address of counsel filing the petition differs from the correspondence address of record. If a new correspondence address is desired by counsel, then a change of correspondence address must be promptly filed in this application in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.33(a)(2). A one-time courtesy copy of this decision is being sent to the address identified in the petition, but all future communications from the Office will continue to be addressed to the correspondence address of record until otherwise notified by applicant.

Inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to Ed Glick at (703) 308-4858.



Edward J. Glick, Special Programs Examiner  
Technology Center 2800  
Semiconductors, Electrical and Optical  
Systems and Components

cc: Daniel P. Maguire  
423 E. Street  
Davis, CA 95616